

## SOME PROBLEMS OF POPULATION MOVEMENTS IN CHINA UNDER THE T'ANG DYNASTY (II)\*

By MANABU NAKAGAWA\*\*

### IV. K'o-hu as Merchants and Casual Laborers

The fact that the old system of levying taxes (*tsu-yung-tiao*) at an empire-wide uniform rate was superseded by the new method of levying agricultural taxes according to the local customs means, probably, that the regional differences of conditions of labor and agricultural productivity grew larger, but it has not yet been testified by enough facts. Therefore, we cannot but go on studying by clarifying the administrative meaning of the term *k'o-hu* as tax-payers under the *liang-shui fa*, for which many scholars have made fine researches from the viewpoint of constitutional history.<sup>40</sup> This two-tax system contains as its supplementary item the regulation of taxation on commercial transactions. The Great Minister Yang Yen suggested in his memorial to the throne in the eighth month of 780 A.D. such as follows.<sup>41</sup>

Households should be registered according to their actual residence, with no distinction whether they are local families or immigrants. Persons should be distinguished according to whether they are rich or poor, not differentiated as 'adults' or 'adolescents'.

In the case of travelling merchants who do not reside in one place, they should pay a one-thirtieth tax in whichever prefecture or county they are. The amount which is taken from them should be estimated so as to be equitable compared with the tax on local residents, to ensure that they do not have any unfair advantage.

The tax on residents is to be collected in autumn and summer. Where there is anything unsuitable to local custom, it is to be corrected.

It is clear from the second paragraph of this quotation that there existed as many travelling merchants as to be levied the special tax on trade, and that there was the possibility of an unfair advantage for them over the local agricultural residents. Then we can pursue the subject by analyzing the actual forms of existence of such travelling merchants as mentioned in terms of *hsing-shang* 行商 and *k'o-shang* 客商, comparing with the native households. Another expression for travelling merchants is *ku-k'o* 估客, that is

\* Part (I) of this article was published in Vol. 9, No. 2 (February 1969) of this Journal.

\*\* Assistant Professor (*Jokyōju*) of Chinese History.

<sup>40</sup> M. Nakagawa, 'Tō, Sō no kyakko ni kansuru shokenkyū', *op. cit.*

<sup>41</sup> D.C. Twitchett, *Financial Administration under the T'ang Dynasty*, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-159.

said, for example in *Yüan-shih Ch'ang-ch'ing chi* 元氏長慶集, to have been accustomed to move unsettledly in search of profit.<sup>42</sup> The state of unsettledness is equally expressed in terms of *fu* 浮, *fu-lang* 浮浪, *liu* 流, and *liu-lang* 流浪, etc. In other words, we can regard travelling merchants who do not reside in one place as a part of floating population from the viewpoint of financial administration.

As Yang Yen mentioned in his memorial, after the rebellion of An Lu-shan, 'the people were dispersed and reduced to becoming vagrants, so that not four or five out of a hundred remained living in their own native place',<sup>43</sup> Another document says such as follows.<sup>44</sup>

Since the years of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 period, the State has been troubled with risings of the armies and rebels in the midlands. Among soldiers, 800 thousands odd have remained to be war potential, but the rest have either been floatingly living by commerce (*fu wei shang-fan* 浮為商販), or become monks so as to evade the special labor services, and thus five or six out of ten have not returned to the agricultural pursuits.

In connection with travelling or floating (*fu*) merchants like this, we remember the term *fu-shih ch'i-min* 浮食奇民 which means the person who lives by unjust and inconstant means, especially by commerce,<sup>45</sup> or *yu-shih chih min* 游食之民 of the same meaning.<sup>46</sup> By way of example, the forewords of the edict of 724 above mentioned (*Chih chüan-nung shih an-fu hu-k'ou chao*, see note 36) says that many people have given up attending to their business (principally in farming), and that, as a result of this, *yu-shih chih t'u* 游食之徒 have not yet all returned to the farming. In the same sense, an edict issued in the first month of 749 A.D. says that '*liu-yung chih pei* 流庸之輩' have gradually returned to the farming while that '*fu-shih* 浮食' have not yet returned.<sup>47</sup>

Stating a conclusion first, the term *liu-yung* means casual laborers who have left their farm lands, working by the day or month in urban areas. Most of these casual laborers seem to have returned to the farming after having gained some earnings in such ways as stated below. In contrast with this, *fu-shih* merchants seem to be in no hurry to return. Why the one tended to be back and the other did not? It goes without saying that, as mentioned above, I would like to know first of all the regional differences of conditions of production, but here I should be contented with mentioning the maldistribution of goods and the regional differences of prices or the seasonal fluctuations in prices.

As to the seasonal or temporary fluctuations in grain prices, the price-regulating granaries (*ch'ang-p'ing-ts'ang* 常平倉) functioned to regulate the market price by operating the quantity of their reserve grains.<sup>48</sup> However, during the T'ang period, they did not function interlocally to equalize prices and to manipulate the commodity distribution varied in different localities, although they were established in almost all important provinces and prefectures.<sup>49</sup> Thus the maldistribution of goods and the regional differences of prices

<sup>42</sup> *Yüan-shih Ch'ang-ch'ing Chi* 元氏長慶集, vol. 23, Ku-k'ou Lê 估客樂.

<sup>43</sup> D.C. Twitchett, *op. cit.*, p. 158 and note 54, p. 337.

<sup>44</sup> M. Nakagawa, 'Tō-dai ni okeru shōgyō-hatten no ichi-sokumen', *op. cit.*, p. 100. *Chiu T'ang shu*, 14, Yüan-ho 元和 5.

<sup>45</sup> M. Nakagawa, *ibid.*, p. 100.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>47</sup> *T'ang Huiyao*, 85, Tao-hu.

<sup>48,49</sup> According to D.C. Twitchett and Seiji Imahori.

were remained unregulated by the administrative control. On the contrary, the state rulers have sometimes taken advantage of these differences. For examples, Liu Yan 劉晏 set up an information bureau for gathering the empire-wide informations on price fluctuations, so as not only to manipulate the prices but also to gain profits.<sup>50</sup> During the last years of the T'ang period, the state rulers encouraged private merchants to accelerate the interlocal transactions.<sup>51</sup> According to an edict issued in the ninth month of 829 A.D., when the provinces of Ho-nan 河南 and Ho-pei 河北 suffered from floods and risings of armies, while in the prefectures in the Yangtze-Huai 江淮 region the people suffered from decline of grain prices as the result of a rich harvest, the matter was made still worse by the local policies of embargoes, known as an abuse of *pi-ti* 閉糶.<sup>52</sup>

Under these conditions of local differences in the distributions and prices of goods, it was natural that travelling merchants appeared numerously in the interlocal commerce. Of course, they were in many cases big merchants such as Wan Chêng 萬貞 of Yang-ch'ou 揚州 who made interlocal trades by carrying goods from a province to another,<sup>53</sup> or as Wang K'o-chiu 王可久 of Ho-nan who was used to gain much profit by trading tea in Chiang-nan 江南.<sup>54</sup> But I think it is the basic point that such big merchants as Wan Chêng and Wang K'o-chiu were never able to engage in trade by themselves without any cooperator. For instance, a dealer in the wood named Hsü Yen-ch'êng 徐彥成, engaged in trade between Hsin-chou 信州 in Chiang-hsi 江西 province and Ch'in 秦 or Huai 淮 provinces, used to buy cedar boards at an advantage from a certain woodman living in a mountain near Hsin-chou river-side market place (*ju-kou ch'ang* 汭口場).<sup>55</sup> The woodman in this instance was perhaps a woodcutter himself who could offer cedar woods and boards for sale at his will, but it is not clear whether he sawed up logs by himself or not. I would like to make a guess that he was a member of such a *k'o-hu* settlement in mountain areas as stated in the last chapter, because *k'o-hu* settlers in mountains used to live by woodcutting, hunting, mining, farming, and trading their mountain products. Therefore, the personal relationship between Hsü Yen-ch'êng and the woodman is a small visible part of the social and economic relations of supply and demand of special products. It may be said that the bigness of big travelling merchants somewhat depends upon the stability of the economic and personal connection with special producers and dealers; among whom *k'o-hu* played an important role. In other words, commercial transactions by the interlocal travelling merchants stood on the basis of various activities of production and local trade by settlers in mountain areas as well as in native villages.

So it became an important problem for the T'ang Government to levy tax effectively on such commercial transactions as involved the various economic activities by various types of *k'o-hu*. In 782, when Chao Tsan 趙贊 suggested the imposition of a 10 per cent tax on the production of tea, lacquer, bamboo and timber for the purpose of the provision of funds for the price-regulating granaries (*ch'ang-p'ing-ts'ang*), he also proposed the imposition of 2 per cent (20 *wen* 文 per *kuan* 貫) tax on commodities and moneys carried by

<sup>50</sup> *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*, 226.

<sup>51</sup> M. Nakagawa, *ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *T'ai-p'ing Kuang-chi*, 太平廣記 346, Mêng-shih 孟氏.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 172, Ts'ui Chieh 崔碣.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 354, Hsü Yen-ch'êng 徐彥成.

merchants passing custom-houses in the frontier urban places of every provinces.<sup>56</sup> Therefore the imposition of commercial tax on travelling merchants is called *kuo-shui* 過稅,<sup>57</sup> collected at the frontier urban places named *kuan chin* 關津,<sup>58</sup> and they had to carry a kind of official passport named *kung-yen* 公驗 or *kuo-so* 過所 specifying the purpose of their journey.<sup>59</sup> Now, we are reminded of the fact that the landless *k'o-hu* farmers had to obtain officially the certificate also called *kung-yen* which was granted through the medium of the tripartite guarantee of the local officials, native influential persons and neighbors in order to become independent landholding peasants.<sup>60</sup> It may be said that *k'o-hu* in the administrative meaning was to be registered as a holder of such an official certificate as *kung-yen* in the latter years of the period of the two-tax system.

However, there was a difficult problem in applying this taxation system to movable properties. As Lu Chih 陸贄 pointed out, different types of property brought in very different rates of return, and to levy a tax on a flat valuation of possessions led to gross inequality in actual taxation.<sup>61</sup> For instance, some properties which are cheap in proportion to the quantity such as farm lands and grains are easy to be levied taxes overestimatedly, while most movable properties easily hidden away in the drawers or pockets such as precious metals, jewels and money, etc., are apt to be left out untaxed. This may be a reason why the two-tax system contains the special regulation of taxation on commercial transactions, and later under the Sung Dynasty a large sum of the tax on trade (*shang-shui*) came to be collected not only in the great towns but also in the small rural market towns, many of which grew during the Five Dynasties,<sup>62</sup> but during the middle of T'ang the difficulty of its application to movable properties remained unresolved. Therefore the fact that *fu-shih* have not yet returned to the farming mentioned in the edict, above quoted, means this difficulty embarrassed the state administrators.

Next, let us try to understand the reason why *liu-yung* had gradually returned to the farm. According to an annotation by Hu San-shêng 胡三省 to Lu Chih's memorial to the throne in 792, the term *liu* means to wander about and the term *yung* to be employed.<sup>63</sup> Yan Shih-ku 顏師古 annotates that *liu-yung* means the employment or and employee under the condition of going away from the farm.<sup>64</sup> The edict in 724 (*Chih chüan-nung shih an-fu hu-k'u chao*) above mentioned says that, after risings of armies and floods, many people were obliged to go away from their native villages, but that, as a result of their farm lands in domiciles being swallowed up, they could not but change their employment from place to place (*liu-chuan* 流轉) in such ways as either of entering under the protection of some powerful families (*yin jên êrh chih* 因人而止) or of earning their own livelihood by themselves rather independently (*yung-li tzu-tzi* 傭力自資). The first type of *liu-yung* in the way of '*yin jên êrh chih*' is mainly involved in the sphere of great estates, so let us glance at the second

<sup>56</sup> D.C. Twitchett, *ibid.*, p. 62 and note 103, p. 274.

<sup>57</sup> See Kaisaburo Hino, 'Tō-dai shō-zei kō 唐代商稅考', *Shakai-keizai-shigaku*, vol. 30, no. 6, 1965.

<sup>58</sup> See Sadao Aoyama 青山定雄, 'Tō Godai no kanshin to shōzei 唐五代の關津と商稅', in his *Tō Sō jidai no Kōtsū to Chishi Chizu no Kenkyū* 唐宋時代の交通と地誌地圖の研究.

<sup>59</sup> See Noboru Niida 仁井田陞, *To So Hōritsu Monjo no Kenkyū* 唐宋法律文書の研究, Part 3, chap. 6, and Yoshiaki Komai 駒井義明, 'Kōken to kasho 公驗と過所', *Tōyō Gakuhō*, no. 40, 1957.

<sup>60</sup> See chapter III.

<sup>61, 62</sup> According to D.C. Twitchett.

<sup>63</sup> *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*, 234.

<sup>64</sup> *Han shu*, 7.

type, 'yung-li tzu-tzi'.

It is not correct to overestimate the independence of *tzu-tzi*, as, according to a memorial by Liu T'ung 劉通 in 721, many people who earned their own livelihood suffered from dire poverty (*yung-lin tzu-tzi chê*, *ch'iung-ku chih liu* 傭賃自資者, 窮苦之流). Originally, it is why they became unable to make their living that they went out for employment. As an instance the following may be quoted: in 682, when the metropolitan area suffered from a famine, the Emperor Kao-tzung 高宗 forced the poor people to remove to towns outside of the area, but a loyal retainer stood against in vain for fear lest the poor peasants should not be back home from a wandering life (*liu-chuan*). In strange places, the poor peasants were hired by the day (*jih-yung* 日傭) or by the month (*yüeh-yung* 月傭). A concrete instance of *jih-yung* is recorded in *T'ai-p'ing kuang-chi* 太平廣記, summarized as follows:

A money-maker Tou Ai 竇乂 employed many day-laborers (*jih-yung jên* 日傭人) in the city of Chang-an 長安. They were hired to pick their steps up worn-out jute sandals (*p'o ma-hsieh* 破麻鞋), then after washing and drying them, to whip and crush them to pieces. Several day-laborers cooperated with the boilers hired to boil dye-stuffs in kneading powders of crushed and riddled sandal jute with the paste of dyes and oil, to pound and mold them into beautiful long candles, 3 *ch'ih* 尺 in length and 3 *tsun* 寸 in diameter each. By the name of 'Holy Candles', he sold more than ten thousands sticks of them.<sup>65</sup>

Generally speaking, we can find two types in the form of *liu-yung*, that is, the simple labor and the skilled labor. Those who engaged in the simple labor went into the extra employment relationship, which was comparatively shortdate. Originally they had a character of seasonal employee during the farmer's leisure season, but it became that they could not help having this character even during the busiest farming season on account of the severe tax collection.

Thus, watching the phenomenon of the migration and the wanderers under the T'ang dynasty, we have had a rough sketch of what *k'o-hu* really was.

## V. *K'o-hu and the Hakkas*\*\*\*

—From the Hakkas' own point of view—

There are quite a few men of letters and historians from Hakka stock who relate the progenitors of Hakka with the *k'o-hu* under the T'ang and Sung dynasties. So, if something really connects *k'o-hu* with the Hakkas, what is it, and in what historical context were the peoples related to each other?

To begin with, let me introduce a view which I think is rather typical. Since the original text is hard to find in Japan, readers are requested to endure not an altogether short

<sup>65</sup> M. Nakagawa, 'Tō-dai no ryūyō ni tsuite 唐代の流庸について', *Tōyōshi Kenkyū*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1967.

\*\*\* It has taken more than five years, after the storm and stress in our university, for me to rewrite the first draft of chapters V to VII. Here is the new series of chapters translated in selection from my recent work: 'Kyakko to Hakka no shiteki-renkan 客戸と客家の史的連関 (Historical Development of the Guest People in China)', *The Hitotsubashi Review*, vol. 72, no. 1, the memorial issue for the Late Professor Yūji Muramatsu 村松祐次, 1974. I am much obliged to Mr. Etsusuke Masuda 増田悦佐 and Mr. Gilbert George for their most generous co-operation in the translation.

translation of the relevant part. The text is "The Ages and Courses of the Migration of the Hakka People to Kaying District" by Mr. Chang Tzu-ming.<sup>66</sup> Mr. Chang, an inhabitant of Djakarta, had a question-and-answer session with his friend one night, on the origin of the Hakkas, in particular, the migration of the Hakkas to Kaying 嘉應 district.

Q: What is the population of Kayin-chou, Mei-hsien as the present administrative section, combined with the formerly affiliated districts of Hsing-ning 興寧, Chiao-ling 蕉嶺, P'ing-yüan 平遠, and Wu-hua 五華?

A: There are no exact statistics available, but as far as I know it amounts to slightly more than a million. From forty to fifty percent of them work away from the home district to earn their living.

Q: How about the distribution among these five districts and their densities of population?

A: Mei-hsien has about half a million, Hsing-ning slightly more than three hundred thousand and each of Chiao-ling, P'ing-yüan and Wu-hua has upward of a hundred thousand. No research has been done yet to investigate the densities.

Q: Why do people of Kaying call themselves 'k'o'?

A: There are many 'k'o-jen' dispersed in the south and the west provinces. Nobody can deny the fact that in the provinces of Fukien, Ssuch'uan, Hunan and Kwanghsi *k'o-jens* are by no means rare. And speaking of Kwangtung, there are plenty of places densely populated by *k'o-jens* in districts such as Ta-pu 大埔, Lo-ch'ang 樂昌, Tzu-chin 紫金, Ch'ü-chiang 曲江, Ho-yuan 河源, Shih-hsing 始興, Lien-p'ing 連平, Hui-yang 惠陽, Ho-p'ing 和平, Po-lo 博羅 and Lung-ch'uan 龍川. So it is not Kaying-chou alone that is 'k'o' county.

Q: No, that's not the answer I want. I don't care to know in which districts the *k'o-jens* live nor the distribution among those districts. What I want to know is the origin of the name 'k'o-jen'.

A: Philologically speaking, 'k'o' means object, the antonym of subject. If the people who arrived before assumed themselves hosts, the people who came afterwards are regarded as guests. Even in the areas dominated by the Hakkas, there were preceding settlers. When our ancestors came over from the Middle Field, then the well domiciled settlers called them *k'o-jens*, and as the time passed by the expression was fixed as a sort of proper noun. In the period of their early migration to the south and the west provinces, our ancestors and the preceding settlers dwelled together. This fact is in record on a book, T'ai-p'ing Huan-yü Chi 太平寰宇記. The place called Mei-chou 梅州 in the book designates Kaying. There already was the distinction between *chu-hu* and *k'o-hu* in registering households. I feel like arousing attention, saying 'Look, this is it. You can see the origin of the name *k'o-jen* is of really ancient origin.'

Q: So, our ancestors migrated from the Middle Field, reclaimed lands, engaged in agriculture, launched industries, founded towns and villages and asserted themselves as the grandeur of the Hakkas today. When did they begin to migrate?

<sup>66</sup> See Chang Tzu-ming 張自銘, 'K'o-jen ch'ien-chü Kayin chih shih-tai yü 'lu-hsien 客人遷居嘉應之時代與路線', in *Finer Pieces of Documents on the Hakka-strains (K'o-tsu wén-hsien sui-chin 客族文獻碎金)*, edited by himself, The Djakarta Daily Vox Dei, Djakarta, 1956 (can be referred to, by the library catalogue number FB 321.64 in the Central Library in Cambridge University).

A: Opinion is divided on the question. One says the migration started to avert the turmoil caused by invasions of the Wu Hu 五胡 or the Five Barbaric Races under the Chin 晉 dynasty. Another remarks it took place when the Rebellion of Huang Ch'ao 黃巢 occurred under the T'ang dynasty. The third one may well claim it was initiated by those who tried to get away from the rule of the conquest dynasties of Chin 金 and Yüan 元. It is evident, however, they migrated gradually throughout these periods. In a poem by Huang Kung-tu 黃公度, a poet of the late Ch'ing 清 days, there is a passage which reads:

Once there were respected clans  
 Moved about to be called *k'o-jens*,  
 Waded across the River Yangtze  
 and plunged into Pa Min 八閩 areas,  
 Wandering around eventually to reach the seaside.

His persistence on their itinerary was not a mere figure of speech.

It's the fourth answer which is most significant. For the sake of accuracy, let me reproduce the original text word by word;

「答：從字義言之，「客」者賓也，主之對也，先至為主，後至為客，今日客人聚居之地，先有土著，吾人之上代，來自中原，土著稱之為客人，遂相沿襲成一名詞，吾人之上代初至西南各地，與土著雜居：太平寰宇記載梅州——梅州即嘉應，戶口已有主戶與客戶之分，可見客人一詞，由來已久矣。」

Secondly, I must refer to the classic work in studies on the Hakkas, Shih K'ü I Chêng 石窟一徵, or An Account from a Rocky Cave by Huang Hsiang-t'ieh 黃香鉄. A passage in the first volume, Chêng-fu P'ien 征撫篇 or The Book on Subjugation, reads as follows;<sup>67</sup>

Since the days of Nan Sung 南宋 days, brigands raided and caused strife anywhere they pleased. As this place had been particularly cursed by their malevolence, it is no wonder that there remained scarcely any surviving subject loyal to the Sung dynasty. As far as T'ai-p'ing Huan-yü Chi recorded, there were twelve hundred and one 'chu 主' households and three hundred and sixty-seven 'k'o 客' households in Mei-chou, while the record in Yüan-fêng Chiu-yü Chih 元豐九域志 shows fifty-eight hundred and twenty-four 'chu' households and sixty-five hundred and forty-eight 'k'o' households. It is easy to see the rapid increase of *k'o-hu* by Yüan-yü 元祐 period.

This passage, of course, was written as a phase in the history of the Hakkas. If we press on to get a more definite picture, we can find a clear description by Mr. Ch'ên P'an 陳槃 as a preface for the facsimile version of the said book;<sup>68</sup>

<sup>67</sup> The facsimile version of the reprint of this book, reprinted at the primary year of Hsüan-t'ung 宣統 under the Ch'ing dynasty, is included in *Chung-kuo shih-hsüeh ts'ung-shu* 中國史學叢書, Second Series, Book 11, Taipei, 1970. This work consists of nine volumes (Vol. 1 deals with 'Frontiers and Subjugation', Vols. 2 and 3 'Culture', Vol. 4 'Manners', Vol. 5 'Almanacs and Everyday Life', Vol. 6 'Geographies', Vols. 7 and 8 'Dialects' and Vol. 9 'Characters, Arts and Literature and Miscellaneous'). Altogether, the work gives us sound groundings to obtain a comprehensive picture about the Hakkas. Especially the volumes on dialects are known to be the classic study on the Hakka-dialects. The passage cited is on page 24 in the facsimile version.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Those who were called 'Mei-chou *hu chu* 戶主' in Yüan-fêng Chiu-yü Chih and T'ai-p'ing Huan-yü Chi are those who came and settled before the Pei Sung 北宋 times. Those who were called 'k'o' are none other but us, the Hakkas. The logical corollary is that our clansmen the Hakkas opened up Mei-chou at the latest by the Pei Sung days.

This is a well established view among the Hakka people.

If we go along with the view mentioned above, we can confine our interest in the genesis of the Hakkas within the problem of the institutional 'k'o-hu' under the T'ang and the Sung dynasties.

Are, then, the Hakkas and *k'o-jens* two different names given to the same continuous stream? It may be so, but not exactly.

K'o-jen Tui 客人对 or Dialogues on Hakkas by Ku Chih 古直 is a case in point. As I could not have access to the original version, I cannot help resorting to quote from secondary sources. Mr. Li I-chung 李翼中 quoted the work in the preface for the facsimile version of Kayin-chou Chih 嘉应州志 edited by Wên Chung-ho 温仲和. After setting the first stage of their migration into Kwangtung in the Tung Chin 東晉 days, the passage reads:

Ancient kingdoms in the Middle Field were tossed about by raging billows to drift away from ancient home. The imperial court itself retreated to the south bank of the River Yangtze. A court-in-exile was set up, and the people who came to the South were treated as transients, meaning temporary residents, or guests. They, however, settled down there to form the *ch'iao* 僑 communities. Thus it came about that those families wearing court caps expanded in Yang-chou 揚州.

From this point of view, these court-cap-wearing families which moved along with the Eastward Retreat of the Chin dynasty were the very core of the Hakkas. On the whole, this is the point all the studies on the history of the Hakkas hitherto maintained unanimously. It is also an accepted view that the ancestors of the Hakkas were the court-cap-wearing families which provided officials for the dynasties in the Middle Field such as Chou 周, Ch'in 秦, Han 漢 and Ts'ao Wei 曹魏, and that in great numbers they fled [away to the South under the Chin dynasty from the tumultuous Middle Field as the Five Barbaric Races founded their Sixteen Kingdoms. As a matter of fact, almost all the chronicles of the Hakka clans impart records suited to this common view. Unless there is a radical rewriting through a textual criticism made in the chronicles of clans, it is hardly likely that this common view, which also agrees well with the authorized histories, shall undergo a drastic change.

Therefore, from the Hakka's own point of view, there are two theories on the origin of the Hakkas, different from each other on the question of when and from what stratum of society the Hakkas emerged. One, the well accepted view, suggests that the source of the Hakkas consisted of the officials or the dominating class under the successive Middle Field dynasties down to the Chin dynasty. The other infers development of the Hakkas from *k'o-hus*, which appear in the registering system of the state under the T'ang dynasty as shown before.

Then, the problem here is boiled down to this: how did the descendants of the ruling



class in the ancient dynasties and the *k'o-hus*, subjects under the T'ang and Sung dynasties interact to form the Hakkas?

## VI. Population Movements from the North to the South

There were people who were domiciled in the Middle Field constituting the ancient Middle Field dynasties who took refuge in the South. In comparison with Nan-jen 南人 or the People of the South who had lived continuously in the former domain of the Kingdom of Wu 吳, they were called Pei-jen 北人 or the People of the North. Between the People of the North and the People of the South, there was a whirl of antagonism and adaptation.<sup>69</sup>

Tung Chin, a dynasty which reconstructed itself by receding to the South in the midst of this confrontation, registered the refugees to the South in special registers called 'Pai Chi 白籍' or the White Registers, distinguished from 'Huang Chi 黄籍' or the Yellow Registers in which those who were not from the Middle Field were registered. Messrs. Hiroshi Masumura and Shigeaki Ochi proved that in the White Registers were sidenotes of the counties where these refugees came from, on a proposal by Fan Ning 范甯 in the fourteenth year of T'ai-yüan 太元, 389 A.D.<sup>70</sup>

Messrs. Masumura and Ochi and Mr. Chikara Yano have different interpretations on the relationship between the White and Yellow Registers and on their treatments under the so-called present residence priority policy.<sup>71</sup> But this much we can take for granted: anyone who had moved in from the Middle Field to the southern bank of the Yangtze was registered in the place where he actually lived, and although it is a point in dispute whether this registration was regarded as a permanent domicile or not, it was called a White Register and distinguished from Yellow Registers, and had a sidenote of the home county

<sup>69</sup> By Mr. Ochi's definitions of the 'People of the North' and the 'People of the South', the former had their original domiciles in the domain of Hsi Chin 西晋 before the subjugation of Wu 吳 by Wei 魏, the latter in the domain of Wu. See Shigeaki Ochi 越智重明, *Gishin Nanchō no Seiji to Shakai* 魏晉南朝の政治と社会 (*Polity and Society under Wei, Chin and the Southern Dynasties*), Part II, Chap. 2, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1963. On the problem of antagonism and adaptation between the People of the South and the People of the North, see 'The People of the North and the People of the South', Chap. 4 of Mitsuo Moriya, 守屋美都雄 *Chūgoku Kodai no Kazoku to Kokka* 中国古代の家族と國家 (*Families and Polity in the Ancient China*), the nineteenth issue of the Series of Studies on Oriental History, Kyōto University, 1968, and Chikara Yano 矢野主税, 'Tōshin ni okeru nanbokujin tairitsu mondai 東晋における南北人対立問題——sono seijiteki kōsatsu その政治的考察—— (Antagonism between the Peoples of the South and the North under the Tung Chin Dynasty—A Political Inspection——)', *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 東洋史研究, vol. 26, no. 3, 1967, and his 'Tōshin ni okeru nanbokujin tairitsu mondai——sono syakaiteki kōsatsu—— (——A Sociological Inspection その社会的考察——)', *Shigaku Zasshi*, vol. 77, no. 10, 1968.

<sup>70</sup> See Hiroshi Masumura, 増村宏 'Kōhakuseki no shin-kenkyū 黄白籍の新研究 (A New Study on the Yellow and White Registers)', *Tōyōshi Kenkyū*, vol. 2, no. 5, 1943, Shigeaki Ochi, 'Ryūyū Seiken to Giki Dodan 劉裕政權と義熙土断', in *Shigematsu-sensei Koki Kinen Kyūsyū-daigaku Tōyōshi Ronsō*, 1957.

<sup>71</sup> Chikara Yano, 'Dodan to Hakuseki——Nanchō no Seiritsu——土断と白籍——南朝の成立——', *Shigaku Zasshi*, vol. 79, no. 8, 1970.

of the person registered.<sup>72</sup>

The reason for the sidenote, as Fan Ning shows us in his proposal, is: 'Though obliged to take refuge on the southern bank of the Yangtze because of the turmoil in past years, they long to return to their home counties. So, they were allowed to enter their home counties in the White Register.' It seems it was unwise for the court to neglect the wish of the subjects to return to their home counties in the Middle Field. That is, at this stage in the end of the fourth century, the hope of going home was strong among the people who had come from the Middle Field and had begun to live in the southern bank of River Yangtze. As the case stood, Fan Ning expected the objection when he decided to propose: 'From now on, we must readjust our boundaries, settle the domiciles of households according to the place where they actually live, clarify the standards of taxation, and establish the system of mutual surveillance.' Fan said the critical debaters would argue that gentlemen will cherish the memories of old ways of living back in their home, and common people will have misgivings about attending to duties.

The argument against his proposal was this: if, with the intention of making the refugees give up their hope to come home and settle down in the place where they actually lived, the court pursued the naturalization policy too vigorously, there is no doubt that gentlemen or officials and court-cap-wearing families would object as they could hardly forsake the old memories, and that common people would object from the fear of added burdens of attending to full duties. Judging from this context, common people as well as officials and court-cap-wearing families were registered in the White Registers with sidenotes of their home counties.

Mr. Yano sees this point in accordance with Mr. Ochi as follows: 'Perhaps, as Mr. Ochi pointed out in his book, the common people who were registered in the White Registers were exempted from corvée and military service. And if the White Registers had been abolished they would have been obliged to bear the burdens.' The difference lies in the interpretations of the words 'gentleman will cherish the memories of the ways of living back in their home.' In my opinion, within the range of their unanimity, we can safely assume that the households which were registered in the White Registers included common people immune from some of the duties.

As long as registered in the White Registers, those were the people with their perpetual domicile somewhere other than the place they actually lived, that is, guest-like people.

<sup>72</sup> Let me translate the whole sentences of the proposal by Fan Ning 范甯, in *Chin Shu* 晋朝, vol. 75, as a must for historical material for studies in this area:

In olden days the distribution and the boundary-setting of land were done to the advantage of farmers. When the holy emperors made the law, there was no distinction between yellow and white in registers. Though obliged to take refuge in the southern bank of the River Yangtze due to turmoil in past years, they long to return to their home counties. So, they were allowed to enter their home counties in the register. Now, as time passed, people became well-established in their occupations, trees grown on their ancestors' tombs, and they all are well-to-do people. Even though nominally they don't have their home here, practically they are settled in this part of Celestial Empire. From now on, we must readjust our boundaries, settle the domiciles of households according to the place where they actually live, clarify the standards of taxation, and establish the system of mutual surveillance. Critics would surely say: 'Everyman has his home in his mind, and customs in the South and the North differ from each other. Once you belong in a household, you are accustomed to it thereafter. Obviously, gentlemen will cherish the memories of the ways of living in their old home and common people will have misgivings about attending to duties.'

And the people exempted from corvée or military service or some other duties, are discriminated from the Yellow Register people as the White Register people and the White Register households. Incidentally although nothing can be or should be said as I did not research into usage of the characters such as *min* 民 or *chia* 家 in connection with the word *pai chi*, I think we should clarify the difference and the similarity, if any, between these words and, say, the word *pai ting* 白丁, meaning a person with no title nor post in the court order.

Now, we can't be far from the point by assuming that the people in the White Register had had something which was inherited by the posterior '*k'o-hu*'. Hitherto, when the Hakkas' origin was sought after in the reigns of the Tung Chin dynasty from the Hakkas' own point of view, too much stress was laid on the phase of their progenitors being officials and court-cap-wearing families who had taken the helm of the ancient Middle Field dynasties. So, the figure of the subjects in the White Registers, who also drifted from the Middle Field to the southern bank of Yangtze, was liable to be left unnoticed. It may well turn out that these petit people '*hsiao-jen* 小人', with their average size of household being tiny, are the missing link which connects the *k'o-hus* with the Hakkas. In this respect, the following sentences by Mr. Ochi are full of suggestions:

Incidentally, the words *hu* 戶 and *chia* 家 had various meanings during the period of the Six Southern Dynasties. Sometimes they can be identified with the '*hu*' or household in the state registration system. Sometimes they mean what we call the three-generation relationship structure. And yet, on other occasions they mean the house with a nuclear family construction. The *hu* in *k'o-hu* shown in the Monograph of Foods and Goods in the authoritative Book of Chin is the third case. I might as well add that in South China the fundamental unit in the economic life was a family more or less with nuclear family construction. This fact is related to the making of *k'o* as the downfall of peasant folk.<sup>73</sup>

There must have been cases of joint flights from the Middle Field, by these *k'o-hus* of the fallen-peasant type and the proto-Hakkas as court-cap-wearing families. Officials among the proto-Hakkas settled on the southern bank of Yangtze, could maintain their position within the governing system of the Tung Chin dynasty, and absorb and employ peasants from the same home counties similarly registered in the White Registers as the *k'o-hus* of the *tien-k'o* or tenant type. From the perspective mentioned above, it remains as a future task to connect studies on the origin of the Hakkas with studies on the *k'o-hu* under the reign of the Six Southern Dynasties.<sup>74</sup>

## VII. From *K'o-hu* to the Hakkas

My picture of the migration was brushed in rather broad colors, that is, the ruling class in the Middle Field dynasties took refuge in the South, leading people under their domination. Clarifying the situation is one thing I have in my mind, but not the whole,

<sup>73</sup> See Shigeaki Ochi, 'Nanchō no kokka to shakai', *Iwanami Kōza: Sekai Rekishi*, vol. 5, 1970, p. 186.

<sup>74</sup> See Shigeaki Ochi, 'Shin Nanchō no koseki to kyakko 晋南朝の戸籍と客戸', *Syakai-keizai-shigaku*, vol. 32, nos. 5 and 6, and Shigekuni Hamaguchi, *Tō-ōchō no Sennin Seido* 唐王朝の賤人制度, the fifteenth issue of the Series of Studies on Oriental History, Kyōto University, 1966.

in bringing out the picture. There was an actual case in point which encouraged me to bring up the hypothesis. The case is of the southward flight of the Wang 王 clan originally in T'ai-yüan 太原, vividly described by the late Dr. Mitsuo Moriya.<sup>75</sup> Here, I would like to make a point clear by citing a passage from it. On the southward flight of the family of Wang Tsê 王沢, he said:

Obviously, the southward flight not only meant loss of all the things the Wangs had in the North China but the migration of the whole household itself was accompanied by grave hardships. Wang Ch'êng 王承, without sowing any strain to his family and domestic servants, carried off the removal leaving other families behind. Those days, the Tung Chin dynasty seems to have been trying to transfer the sphere of its dominancy to the southern bank of Yangtze in association with reputable families. So, the people from the families which had supported the rule of the dynasty at that time were able to secure their aristocratic status.<sup>76</sup>

As Dr. Moriya saw it, as long as the Tung Chin dynasty lasted the southward flight paid handsome dividends. The problem awaits thereafter. What happens, if the prop is taken away? What comes, if the dynasty is extinguished and nepotism is of no help in the political arena? The ex-governing group, expelled from and in uncertain terms with the regime, would strive to defend themselves by some means or another. I think it is in the latter half of the T'ang reigns that this situation was reaching its boiling point.

One thing I would like to point out is an example of groups of *t'ao-hus* 逃戶, I mentioned in the introduction of this paper.<sup>77</sup> If we imagine the movements of *t'ao-hus* and vagrants gathered up in *Yu-ch'i hsien* 尤溪縣, *Chiang-chou* 江州, *Sha hsien* 沙縣, *T'ai-p'ing hsien* 太平縣 and *Shih-pi-shan* 石壁山 from the last years of *K'ai-yüan*, and in *Pi-shan hsien* 壁山縣, *Yü chou* 渝州, *Ssu-ch'uan* in the reign of Su-tsung 肅宗, and if we think of solidity of their unity in the case of 'led by Kao Fu 高伏, bandits are more than a thousand households' in *Yu-ch'i* we can safely assume that a part of the ex-governing group, then out of the regime, with nothing to rely on but their own self-defence yet emulating the regime, were there. Also, we can see the case of the Hakka Lu 盧 clan in the same setting.<sup>78</sup> When the Hou Liang 後梁 dynasty founded itself in the Middle Field after subverting the T'ang dynasty, the Lu clan sought to cooperate with the new dynasty. This was the advancement of the Hakkas in the days of transition revolving around the uprising of Huang Ch'ao. This Lu clan, for example, without the nepotistic influence or economic power they had had in Fan-yang 范陽, roved about mountains in the South China, rallied *k'o-hus* including poor peasants, small retailers, artisans and miners, as stated before, making use of their fame of the past, and pursued the way of collective self-defence. Although they

<sup>75</sup> See Mitsuo Moriya, *Rikuchō Monbatsu no ichi kenkyū—Taigen Ō-shi Keifu-kō—六朝門閥の一研究—太原王氏系譜考—(A Study on the Six Dynasties—an Investigation into the Pedigree of the Wang Clan in T'aiyüan—)*, in the Toyo University Series of Academic Works, 1951.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>77</sup> See M. Nakagawa, 'Soyōchō-hō kara ryōzei-hō eno tenkan-ki ni okeru seidoteki-kyakko no sozei-futan', *op. cit.*, pp. 81-87. There is a criticism made by Mr. Mamoru Tonami 磯波護; 'Tō no nirsuryōtaisei to Ubunyū no kakko 唐の律令体制と宇文融の括戸; *Tōhō-gakuhō*, Kyoto, vol. 41, 1970, and 'Ryōzei-hō seitei izen ni okeru kyakko no zeifutan 兩税法制定以前における客戶の税負担', *Tōhō-gakuhō*, Kyoto, vol. 43, 1972. I am very interested in these works, but they were not relevant to this chapter. I think it convenient to postpone the answer by re-examining the foregoing relevant chapters of this paper.

<sup>78</sup> M. Nakagawa, 'Tō-matsu Ryō-sho Kanan no kyakko to Hakka Ro-shi', *op. cit.*

were not totally committed to the T'ang dynasty as so-called *chu-hus* were, they were rooted in the *k'o-hu* class, as what we might call the auxiliary members of the state, controlled by the state. So they were half included in the system of the state and dependent on nepotistic authority, even if it was only an afterglow. As far as they went along with these factors, they could not carry the resistance against the vicissitudes of the dynasties in the Middle Field to the bitter end.

Since the re-registering policy by Yü-wen Jung, establishment of the system of *chu-hu* and *k'o-hu* was pursued as a state policy. In the formative period, it was a system to prevent the native *chu-hus* who constituted the economic basis of their reigns from dispersing or running away by binding the transient *k'o-hus* about them.<sup>79</sup> Succeeding in this policy under the T'ang dynasty, the Sung courts operated it in combination with the brushed-up dual taxation system or *liang-shui fa* 兩税法. The framework of the rule over people was constructed as the household-grading system or *hu-têng chih* 戶等制, and as a safeguard for the firm grip upon the *chu-hu*, they graded *k'o-hu* beneath the *chu-hu* class.<sup>80</sup> For both the T'ang and Sung Dynasties, without *chu-hu* there was no basis for their existence. To prevent the yoke over them getting loosened, it was imperative to pool the runaway *chu-hus* as *k'o-hus*, or else they would get completely out of rule as *t'ao-hu* or lost households. To defend the stronghold of *chu-hu*, the moat of *k'o-hu* was trenched. As a moat, *k'o-hus* were exposed to severe attacks. But, as long as they were *k'o-hus* incorporated in the system of state rule, they were tied up with meagre tax reductions as compensation. And they were expected to strictly observe mutual-surveillance within neighborhoods. As matters stood, *k'o-hus* could not devote themselves to overthrowing the regime at least as *k'o-hus*.

Seen geographically, it is no coincidence that the institutional *k'o-hu* or a systematized buffer zone in the state can be plotted in frontiers and underdeveloped areas.<sup>81</sup> In the case of Mei hsien cited before, increase of the *k'o-hus* shows us conflict in the manner of political effort to bind up the increased proportion of people as *k'o-hu* and to strengthen the buffer effect. The growing numbers of *k'o-hus*, however, turned the strength of sheer quantity into the force of self-defence, and began to act independently. Mei hsien is the model case in point, and here the highly self-reliant Hakka group was formed embracing the whole district. We would not be surprised if it was a few of the clan-communities among the fallen reputable families which were proud of their origins in the Middle Field, that worked as axes of *k'o-hus'* self-reliance.

This is merely a rundown commentary to recognize the historical relationship between *k'o-hus* and the Hakkas. On any point at issue, there are heaps of detailed

<sup>79</sup> M. Nakagawa, 'Tō-dai no kyakko ni yoru tōkiden no hoyū', *op. cit.*: 'Tō-dai ni okeru kakko jikkō-hōshiki no henka ni tsuite', *op. cit.*

<sup>80</sup> See Setsuko Yanagida, 'Sō-dai kokka kenryoku to nōson chitsujo—Kotō-sei shihai to kyakko—宋代国家権力と農村秩序——戸等制支配と客戸', *Zen-kindai Ajia no Hō to Shakai*, 前近代アジアの法と社会, *Works in Memorial of the Late Doctor Noboru Niida*, vol. 1, Keisō Shobō, 1967, and her 'Kyōson-sei no tenkai 郷村制の展開', Iwanami Kōza: *Sekai Rekishi*, vol. 9, 1970.

<sup>81</sup> See Setsuko Yanagida, 'Sō-dai tochi-shoyū ni mirareru futatsu no kata—Senshin to henkyō—宋代土地所有にみられる二つの型——先進と辺境——' *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō*, vol. 29, 1966, and her 'Sō-dai no kyakko ni tsuite', *op. cit.*, and Yasuhiko Satake 佐竹靖彦; 'Sō-dai Shisen Kishū-ro no minzoku-mondai to tochi-shoyū mondai 宋代四川夔州路の民族問題と土地所有問題', *Shirin* 史林, vol. 50, no. 5, 1967, and vol. 51, no. 1, 1968.

monographs by learned seniors. I might be easily lost in woods of interpretations and disputes. What I wrote down here is a hint of which way to go, where to dwell upon, and how to proceed while not to be too excursive.